



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

NOV 21 2005

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.  
400 WEST MAPLE ROAD  
SUITE 350  
BIRMINGHAM MI 48009

In re Application of	:	
Rainer Grimm et al.	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Application No. 10/089,041	:	TO WITHDRAW THE
Filed: August 27, 2002	:	HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT
For: VEHICLE DOOR AND ASSEMBLING	:	
METHOD AS WELL AS DISASSEMBLING	:	
METHOD FOR THE SAME	:	

This is a decision on applicants' petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment, filed in the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), on September 24, 2004. There is no fee for this petition.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

A review of the file record reveals that the application became abandoned for failure to respond to the Office action mailed on January 22, 2004, which set a three-month extendable period for response. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on August 06, 2004.

Applicants' petition contends that the Office action mailed on January 22, 2004 was never received.

There is a strong presumption that Office communications properly addressed and delivered to the United States Postal Services, are in fact delivered to the addressee. An allegation that the Office communication was not received must be overcome by a showing that it was not received.

The showing required to establish non-receipt of an Office communication must include all of the following requirements:

- (1) A statement from the practitioner stating the Office communication was not received by the practitioner;
- (2) A statement attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office communication was not received; and
- (3) A copy of the docket record where the non-received Office communication would have been entered had it been received and docketed must be attached to and referenced in practitioner's statement.

In support of the contention of non-receipt, applicants have provided a statement from the practitioner stating that the Office communication was not received, a statement from the practitioner and from the practitioner's docketing administrator attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office action was not received, a copy of the docket record where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received and docketed, and, a copy of the docket records showing all responses due by practitioner's office around the three-month due date. This evidence is acceptable proof of non-receipt as provided by 1156 OG 53.

The application is being forwarded to the Supervisory Legal Instruments Examiner with instructions to withdraw the abandonment, return the application to pending status and to redate and remail the Office action mailed January 22, 2004 based on the reasoning in the case of *Delgar v. Schuyler*, 172 USPQ 513.

It is noted that applicants have provided a response to the original Office action mailed January 22, 2004 with this petition.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Randolph A. Reese", is written over a horizontal line.

Randolph A Reese  
Special Programs Examiner  
Technology Center 3600  
(571) 272-6619

RAR/rjc: 08/23/05